

SUMMARY
Agriculture, Fish and Water (AFW) Process
ID Executive Committee – Meeting #4

Date: July 17 – 18, 2000

Place: Cedars Inn, Okanogan, WA

Attendees: See attendance list.

July 17th – Presentations and Field Trip

The Exec. Cmte. and other participants were given a classroom overview of the Salmon Creek restoration project, which included an on the ground tour of specific sites, by the Colville Tribes and Okanogan Irrigation District. **Mike Rundlett will write a letter of thanks.**

July 18th – Business Meeting

SUMMARY OF KEY ISSUES, DECISIONS, AND ACTIONS:

1. Review and Approval of the May 15 – 16 Exec. Cmte. Meeting Minutes:

- After introductions were made, the Committee approved the minutes without any changes.

2. 4(d) Rules Update:

- Steve Landino gave a brief update on the 4(d) rules, explaining the implementation schedule. Copies of the final rules are available on NMFS' website (www.noaa.gov).
- A discussion was held on the concept of "harvestable levels of fish". NMFS stated that they do not see any difference between recovery, survival, or harvestable levels. They feel that standards are the same. NMFS concentrates on one bar and that bar is developed with the characteristics of the species and the habitat.
 - For the Sept. 19th Exec. Cmte. meeting agenda, a concentrated discussion will continue on compliance tools, harvestable, how recovery plans link, ID interest, instream flow issues, and endangered species listings.
- Gerry Jackson gave a brief update on the bull trout ESA listings. Full protection is in place with ongoing liability and investigations. USFWS sees a HCP, 4(d) rule, or Sec. 7 as a viable compliance tool, which ever works best for the specific situation. Feels this process will contribute to either form or possibly all three for other users.

3. Guidelines Document Report:

- The Exec. Cmte. was given a copy of the DRAFT guidelines document, understanding that many tweaks still need to be made by the Workgroup and that it's a long ways from being final.
 - The question was asked, "How does this fit into the regional, state, watershed, etc. scheme?" This discussion was set aside to be answered at a later date.

Chapter 1:

- A narrative will be written soon.

Chapter 2:

- It hasn't been decided where to locate Ch. 2's contents yet. The Workgroup will continue to work
 - NMFS noted that they have had workload problems in group participations. Splitting time seems to be a common practice. Not knowing how many IDs will participate, NMFS may not have the ability to participate in every process. Feels a "strike team" would be a concept to take advantage of knowing that there will always be participants available.
 - IDs may also have staffing issues and wouldn't want to be lost in the shuffle, noting that the process takes people, which takes money.

Chapter 3:

- Ch. 3's purpose is to help the IDs articulate their district facilities, operation, and maintenance in a manner that will be helpful for approval of the final CIDMP. A deep understanding of the infrastructure is needed and comments can be provided to Tom Myrum.

Chapter 4:

- Still in development stage. The goal was to create an assessment that looks at an IDs' process, which works with ESA/CWA assessments.
- Many questions were raised regarding instream flow. For instance:
 - ✓ How will the various agencies address the issue of instream flows?
 - ✓ Are we creating something broad or narrow?
 - ✓ How do we get the water in the stream and keep it there?
 - ✓ What are the responsibilities needed?
 - ✓ How do you address operations in a low-flow timeframe?
 - ✓ Where does Sec. 7 stop and start?
 - ✓ What are the IDs fears?
- It was felt that some questions needed to be answered at the policy level before a technical team was created to address instream flow. There's a need to sort out the

context; 1) Water Quantity 2) Water Quality 3) Habitat. A clear understanding of what the group is shooting for needs to be articulated. It was noted that the process is here to make sure not only the IDs have certainty, but also the fish by determining what the biological needs are. ***Note:** Following the summary and for your reference is a typed version of the easel notes taken during the instream flow discussion.*

- **AFW staff was tasked with putting together an instream flow issues paper from the meeting discussion. Feedback will be gathered from Exec. Cmte. members by phone, with something ready to present at the Sept. 19th EC meeting.**

Chapter 5:

- Ch. 5 reflects the ESA/CWA elements that will be part of the agreement. A work in progress, this section will be moved to Ch. 4.

Chapter 6:

- Ch. 6 details the process for adaptive management and how it reflects with the assessments.

Chapter 7:

- Ch. 7 will identify funding needs, sources, and strategy. The narrative of this chapter has been postponed, but the group will be discussing short time funding in the near future.

Chapter 8:

- The narrative will be written soon.

4. Next Meetings

- Workgroup Meeting – **August 30th, 10:00am – 2:00pm, Ellensburg PUD**
Brown Bag Lunch
- Exec. Cmte. Meeting – **September 19th, Ellensburg Best Western**

Instream Flow Issues
Easel Notes—ID EC Meeting, July 18, 2000

- “Dumb flows” – avoiding this approach, use flexibility
- Highly variable contexts (?) To consider for IDs
- Interactions between agencies (state, feds, USBR, Services, IDs, and other
- Inter-relationships between other pieces, activities that are going on
- Equity for IDs, what they have to do for their fair share
- Water instream for fish is needed
- State water allocation and ESA bars are not necessarily the same process
- Outline the tools for getting to the instream flows and how to keep it there
- Systems efficiency within watersheds

Proposal: A small policy group to help frame up the discussion for the EC table.

- Quantity and quality to meet the biological needs of fish-needs must be met
- How to get there? Can/will need to be creative
- Keep it specific to the ID situation for specific solutions in that area.
- Giving up some water may be a necessary part of a solution in some situations, other measures may be all that is needed in others. Situation specific.
- Conservation of water for species
- Storage issue is important to instream flow issues
- Strategy within watershed and the ID role within the strategy
- Need to function in context with the whole ecosystem with the basin – land use, food web, etc. and instream flow is part of it. Ultimately, have to recover watersheds.
- Fold into an overall recovery strategy.
- USBR Section 7 consultations with NMFS and interactions with water users and others during this process
- How to address operations during low-flow and drought situations
- Buttons and triggers – to change if needed (adaptive management)

Attendee List
July 18, 2000

Name	Organization
Allan, Doug A.	Trout Unlimited
Bambrick, Dale	NMFS
Bush, Jodi	USFWS
Carpenter, Jack	Kittitas Reclamation Dist.
Crerar, Linda	WSDA
Erickson, Dick	ECBID
Fite, Walt	USBR
Halupka, Karl	USFWS
Hirsh, David	NMFS
Jackson, Gerry	USFWS
Konovsky, John	WCC
Landino, Steve	NMFS
Leib, Brian	WSU
Myrum, Tom	WSWRA
Newkirk, Ray	DOE
Noble, Sandy	USFWS
Priest, Jim	Colville Tribe
Robinson, Bill	Trout Unlimited
Rundlett, Mike	WCC
Schwisow, Mike	WSWRA
Smauelson, Carl	WDFW
Smith, Paula	WCC
Smith, Rick	Wenatchee Reclamation Dist.
Thomas, Jeff	USFWS
Wallace, Dick	DOE
Willis, Lynn	WSDA